DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 574 TM 012 616

AUTHOR Carlson, Roger D.
TITLE "At Risk" in Kindergarten: A Study of Selection, Retention, Transition, and Promotion.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Achievement Tests; Followup Studies; Grade 1; *Grade Repetition; *High Risk Students; Interpersonal Competence; *Kindergarten; *Kindergarten Children; Low Achievement; Primary Education; Student Placement; *Student Promotion; *Transitional Programs

ABSTRACT

The effects of kindergarten-grade 1 transitional classrooms in Eugene (Oregon) compared with retention or promotion of students to grade 1 were studied in an evaluation of two transitional classrooms. Focus was on determining the effects of retention, transition, and promotion on student achievement and social skills. Students entering a transition class (n=26), graduating transitional students (n=20), and retained students who had 2 years of kindergarten (n=20) were compared to regular first graders (n=43) and a control group for follow-up for 4 years (n=59). These students were administered the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Level B; and each student's teacher completed the Walker-McConnell Test of Children's Social Skills. These tests were used to assess program differences. It was generally found that when a child was targeted as "at risk," either kindergarten-grade 1 transitional classes or kindergarten retention yielded beneficial effects that were superior to promotion into first grade. An "at risk" child without intervention continued to be marginal into the fourth year of school. Differences between this and other studies with discrepant findings are interpreted as possibly being due to differences in design, sample, or treatment characteristics. Ten tables summarize study findings. (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302574

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ROGER D. CARLSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

"At Risk" in Kindergarten: A Study of Selection, Retention, Transition, and Promotion

Roger D. Carlson

Willamette University

Running Head: "AT RISK" IN KINDERGARTEN

TM012616

Abstract

This study was concerned with the effects of K-1 transitional classrooms when compared with kindergarten retention. The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Level B, and Walker-McConnell Test of Children's Social Skills were used to assess differences in program outcomes and gains. Generally, it was found that when a child is targeted as "at risk" either K-1 transitional classes or kindergarten retention yield beneficial effects which are superior to promotion into first grade. An "at risk" child without intervention continues to be marginal into the fourth year of school. The results are compared to other studies showing discrepant findings, and differences between the results of studies are interpreted as possibly being due to differences in design, sample, and/or treatment characteristics.

"At Risk" in Kindergarten:
A Study of Selection, Retention, Transition, and Promotion

Transitional classes have been added to many elementary schools in an effort to provide an year-long preparatory interlude in the educational progress of students who, at the end of kindergarten, are judged not to be adequately prepared for first grade. Several studies have been done in order to evaluate the effectiveness of such programs (see review article by Gredler [1984]). The preponderance of evidence to date appears to be negative.

Raygor's (1972) study attempted to distinguish between the effects of a transitional classroom and kindergarten retention. At the end of either the transitional year, or an extra year of kindergarten, Raygor found that transitional students had higher mean change scores on a number of measures of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests than did kindergarten repeaters. No statistically significant differences were found between the Stanford Achievement Test scores of those who were in a transitional classroom when compared to those who were retained in kindergarten. Both groups, however, obtained scores which were significantly higher than those students who were "at risk", but did not take the additional year of

kindergarten or have access to the transitional classroom. Differences between the two groups were not sustained in third and fourth grade teachers' ratings in areas of scholastic achievement (reading and arithmetic) as well as social-emotional adjustment, and motor skill development.

Matthews (1977) found no statistically significant differences of transition classroom students at either the second or third grade levels on standard measures of achievement when compared with peers who were "at risk" yet were not enrolled in such a class, and when compared to their own grade cohorts.

Leinhardt (1980) found that "at risk" kindergarten students are better off in an integrated first grade classroom than a transitional classroom in terms of outcomes of reading instruction.

In a similar study, Talmadge (1984) found problems in the selection procedures for existing transitional classes, as well as finding reading scores among regular first grade students to be higher than those of transitional graduates despite an additional year of transitional instruction and maturation.

Most recently, Shepard and Smith completed a study on the effects of retention on academic and social outcomes (see Shepard and Smith, 1985, Shepard and Smith, 1986, and Bracey, 1986). Because of their lack of statistically significant differences and inability

to reject most of their null hypotheses, they conclude that retention had little or no effect on a number of student characteristics, including academic achievement and social development.

The present study represents the results of an evaluation of two transitional classrooms in Eugene Public Schools, Oregon. Comparisons were made between entering and graduating transitional students, as well as with retained, and regularly promoted students in terms of achievement as well as social skills. Another group that was targeted for a transitional class but never having entered such a program was tracked to the beginning of their fourth year of school in order to assess achievement and social skill differences. Thus, the purpose of the study was to compare the effects of retention, transition, and promotion.

Method

First Grade Subjects.

Entering Transition Class Students (T1). Students were selected for T1 on the basis of a number of end of kindergarten teacher-made tests combined with the recommendations of teachers and the consent of parents. Since funding of T1 classes was through Chapter 1 moneys, half of the students were candidates who were resident at the two schools served by Chapter 1 moneys at which the transition classrooms were also resident.

The other half of the T1 students were those who were resident in schools served by Chapter 1 funding.

The schools which contain the transition classes are in working, lower middle class neighborhoods, which have a high degree of mobility. The two transition classes which had a maximum size of approximately half (13-14) of the usual first grade class (26-30) were taught by very experienced and qualified teachers. One teacher had degrees in both education and special education. The other teacher had 17 years of teaching experience from kindergarten through third grade.

The transition classes differed from kindergarten and first grade in a number of respects: (1) The transition class met for a full day rather than a half day as in kindergarten. (2) It was an entirely self contained classroom (vs. first grade which had different teachers fro reading and/or math). (3) It was a "non-hurried" environment. (4) It allowed for some trial participation with first graders.

The T1 group was composed of 11 males and 15 females entering either one of two transition classes located at two separate schools.

Transition Class Graduates (XT1). Students who were selected into transition classes which became the XT1 group were selected on the basis of teacher-made tests combined with recommendations of teachers and consent of parents. Only those students who were

resident at the two schools in which the transition classrooms were provided, were admitted into the transition class. Teachers were the same as for T1 students.

Fifteen males and 5 female previous year graduates of the two transition classes in the district constituted the XT1 group.

Kindergarten Retained (KK1). All students who were entering first grade and who were identified by their teachers as having had two kindergarten years in Eugene School District were included in the sample of kindergarten repeaters. Selection was on the basis of teacher recommendation and parental consent. Half day in regular kindergarten classrooms. Some students half day also in first grade classroom. The sample consisted of 15 males and 5 females and were resident at nine schools throughout the district.

Regular First Graders (G1). Every first grade teacher who rated a child in the aforementioned groups had a child chosen of the same sex as the target child at random from his/her class roster for rating as well. If that child was not in the XT1 and KK1 groups and had been through a regular Eugene School District kindergarten, that child constituted a control subject in the G1 group. There were 28 males and 15 females in that group of those subjects.

Follow-up Targeted Subjects

A group of 59 kindergarten students throughout the Eugene School District were identified in Spring, 1984 by their kindergarten teachers as students who would be good candidates for a K-1 transition class. As that group entered their fourth year of school 45 were identified; two had been classified as "mildly handicapped" and were excluded from further analysis. Of the remaining 43, two were on Individual Educational Plans, and five were being served by Chapter 1 resources (three in reading and math, one in reading only, and one in math only).

Targeted/Retained Second Grade Group (T2). Twenty two students of the original 59 were known to have been retained at kindergarten or first grade. Of those, 14 males and 4 females were still in the district going into second grade, and were available for rating. Eight males were retained at kindergarten, while the remaining 6 were retained in first grade. All 4 females were retained in first grade.

Targeted/Non-Retained Third Grade Group (T3). Twenty-one students of the original 59 were entering third grade and thus had no history of retention. Of those, 10 males and 6 females had end of second grade CTBS data and were available for ratings of social skills.

Non-Targeted/Non-Retained Control Second and Third Grade Control Groups (C2 and C3). For each teacher rating a child designated as T2 or T3, another child not in T2 or T3 of the same sex was randomly selected by the investigator to be rated by the same teacher. For teachers who had multiple numbers of targeted children, an equal number of randomly selected children were chosen for rating. Teachers were required to rate no more than four children.

Potential for Sampling Error

Self-selection factors affected the composition of the above groups slightly. Those factors were due to family relocations out of the district, and a few refusals to cooperate by teachers and parents. It was assumed that such error was evenly distributed throughout the groups selected.

A summary of the composition of all groups is given in Table 1.

Procedure

Each teacher of a child in any of the above groups was requested to complete the Walker-McConnell Test of Children's Social Skills.

In addition, a request was made of all parents of children in junior first or first grade identified as belonging in each of the groups above to have their child tested on Level B of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (Form U) which is appropriate for

mid-kindergarten to mid-first grade. Permission was granted by parents of 83% per cent of the total number of children. Children were tested in small groups of children (ranging in size from 1 to 8) selected from the same school. Children were administered the following scales: Word Attack, Reading Vocabulary, and Reading Comprehension. Verbatim instructions were given to students from the test manual (CTB, 1981) by the test administrators.

Results

Entering transitional class students were compared with three other groups of students on measures of achievement and social skills; namely, (a) transition class graduates of the previous year, now entering first grade, (b) entering first grade students who had repeated kindergarten, and (c) regular entering first grade students who did not fall into category a or b above.

The Walker-McConnell checklist, which has been factor analyzed, has three clusters of items. Those clusters have been labeled: (a) teacher-preferred social behavior, (b) peer-preferred social behavior, and (c) school adjustment behavior.

Screening and Selection

Entering Transition Classroom Students. The CTBS and Walker-McConnell outcomes of entering transition classroom students were compared to those of regular

entering first grade students who had no history of repeating kindergarten, and are shown in Tables 2 and 3. Tests of significance revealed significant t-tests ($p<.01$) on all three scales of the CTBS as well as Reading Total. Walker-McConnell results were significant ($p<.05$) on the Teacher Preferred Social Behavior, Peer Preferred Social Behavior, and Total Scale Score, however the difference between the groups in School Adjustment Behavior was not statistically significant.

Longitudinal Follow-Up of Transition Class Candidates.

Comparisons were made between the group of students who were thought by their kindergarten teachers to be "in need" of a K-1 transition class, and their non-"targeted" peers. End of second grade CTBS data (Level D, Form U) data was available for 17 of the 21 entering third graders who had no history of retention at kindergarten or first grade but who had been targeted for transition classroom as kindergartners (Group T3). Those data were compared with CTBS data for the remainder of the second grade class in the district. The summary of CTBS data is shown in Table 4. Tests of statistical significance revealed that there were statistically significant differences in reading, language, and math of the CTBS.

T3 and G3 were also rated on the Walker-McConnell

Checklist of Social Skills. Results of that comparison are shown in Table 5. There were statistically significant differences between the means of all sub-scales and the total scale scores between the groups.

Program Effectiveness

Students entering transition classes were compared with students who had been through a transition class and were currently entering first grade. The CTBS results are shown in Table 6. There were statistically significant differences ($p<.01$) between the means of all subscales of those administered on the CTBS.

On the Walker-McConnell, there were statistically significant differences between the students entering the program and those leaving the program on all scales as well as total scores. Results are shown in Table 7.

Effects of Retention

Comparisons were made among those students who had been targeted when they were kindergartners as good candidates for a transition class, and who now entering their fourth year of school: namely, between those students who had been retained in kindergarten or first grade, and those who had not. Tests of significance revealed statistically significant differences on the School Adjustment Behavior sub-scale ($p<.01$), as well as the full scale scores ($p<.05$) of the Walker-McConnell, with the advantage in favor of those

students who had been retained. Summary statistics are shown in Table 8.

Since end of first grade CTBS data is not routinely collected within the district and is elected by a minority of district schools, end of first grade achievement data was not uniformly available for the group that had been retained. However, end of second grade data for T3 was significantly depressed when compared with district wide second grade data as is shown in Table 4.

Effects of Retention vs. Transition

A comparison was made between the CTBS scores of transition class graduates (XT1) with students who had two years of kindergarten within the district (KK1). The only statistically significant difference between the means on the sub-scales was in Word Attack which was superior for transition class graduates. No Walker-McConnell sub-scale or total scale differences between the two groups were statistically significant. Summary statistics for the groups are shown in Tables 9 and 10.

Discussion

The group selected for the transition class was clearly different from regular first grade students as indicated by the statistically significant differences in achievement and social skills (with the exception of school adjustment behavior). Presumably, because the

groups were similar in being new to the conventions of schooling, no difference on that sub-scale of the Walker-McConnell should be expected.

The group targeted by kindergarten teachers for transition class, but not retained through the third grade also was clearly different from their non-targeted cohort as revealed by statistically significant differences in all areas of achievement which were tested at the end of second grade, as well as all factors of the Walker-McConnell which teachers completed at the beginning of third grade.

Together, those findings show that teachers can be good judges of who may profit from a transition class and the distinctiveness of the targeted group is robust into the third grade.

Transition class entrants when compared with transition class graduates also were significantly different on all dimensions of achievement which were tested as well as all factors of the Walker-McConnell.

Those who were targeted as in need of a transition class, and were retained were significantly superior in School Adjustment Behavior and social skills generally when compared to those who were not retained.

The only statistically significant difference between the transition class group and kindergarten repeaters was on the word attack scale of the CTBS. There were no statistically significant differences

between those groups in any of the social skill areas.

In all, these results are not consistent with those of Shepard and Smith, and indicate that characteristics of students selected for transition seem to be robust up to the third grade. Further, significant change occurs between pre- and post-transition class making those students who are selected as candidates more like their regular first grade peers. Retention at either kindergarten or first grade also appears to hasten that process. It is not clear that transition classes have effects which are uniquely different than kindergarten retention.

A number of reasons could explain those inconsistencies. Whereas Shepard and Smiths used "post-only," the present study employed pre- and post-measures. In addition a more sensitive measure of social behaviors was used in the present study in order to measure social maturity. The effects of half day kindergarten retention were compared to those of full day transitional classroom for children who were viewed as "at risk." In addition, students who were targeted as "in need" of a K-1 transition class by their kindergarten teachers were followed to third grade entry at which time social skill assessments were conducted.

Shepard and Smith's study involved matching students on sex, birthday, socio-economic status, and

Santa Clara Plus scores at schools which were judged to differ only in their retention rates (school size, socio-economic status, and mean scores on the CTBS were judged to be the same). Since the schools then presumably differed only on the retention rate variable, it was reasoned that students who were retained at a school having a higher overall retention rate would not have been retained at another school with a lower retention rate.

Despite Shepard and Smiths' attempts to account for problems in sampling, matching is difficult at best. Shepard and Smith may have failed to match schools and students as well as their design assumes. If that were the case, then the extra kindergarten year could have increased the scores on the group having the extra year. Likewise it could have served as a "maturational" year, thus yielding higher scores at the end. Or it could truly have had no effect. One simply would not know.

The investigators may have chosen measures that were impervious to or not sensitive enough to detect differences between the groups which they were studying. For example, as a measure of social behavior Shepard and Smith simply asked teachers to rate and rank the children in terms of gross categories: "above grade level", "at grade level", and "below grade level". If the authors had been successful at

prematching retained and non-retained students, one would not be surprised to find no differences in the judgments of teachers. Such gross judgments as measures were so global, that they may have lacked the sensitivity to detect subtle differences in social behavior that the extra year of retention might have affected. Asking teachers about the grade level appropriateness of social behavior of retained students matched with non-retained supposedly like-matched students, begs the question about the effect of retention on social behavior.

When no statistically significant differences are found and one is unable to reject the null hypothesis, one's study does not tell one why that was the case. Presuming that the reason for the inability to reject the null hypothesis was because of program ineffectiveness assumes perfection in the design and measures that were used.

The investigators used a post-test only design whereby the outcome measures of retained versus non-retained students were compared. Assessing program effectiveness is difficult for Shepard and Smith because they did not pre-test at the beginning of the kindergarten year.

More broadly, differences in the effects of transitional programs from study to study probably reflect the lack of identity of treatment effects. In

comparing the treatments, the operational definition of a "transitional class" is any class that is called a transitional class which intervenes between kindergarten and first grade. The curricula of such classes could be widely varied and thus the treatments not the same. If, however, the effects were due to maturation alone, one would expect all studies to have positive effects. Yet an examination of the literature reveals that that is not the case. In light of the probably high degree of variation between curricula, the positive effects of transitional classrooms probably argue more for the success of a particular curriculum or teaching staff, more than for the universal efficaciousness of lack thereof or transitional classrooms.

Differences between studies could be due to programmatic differences as well as differences in sample, or the interactions between samples and programs. For example, the present study was done with a medium size predominantly white working class sample. Leinhardt's (1980) study was done in an urban area in which 62% were black in a low to middle income group. Talmadge's (1984) sample consisted of predominantly white (88%), middle class, semi-rural students, 65% of which were dependents of Navy or Marine personnel on active duty. The differences in the outcomes of those studies could as easily be a result of unique program

characteristics and population demographics as they could be due to the effect of having something called a transitional class per se.

At a time of considerable national concern about the "at risk" student, it seems premature to recommend the abandonment of programs which have significant effects upon those kindergarten students, who, if left to compete with their cohorts, continue to be marginal into the third grade. Instead of advocating universal abandonment of such programs, a more positive approach would be to try to discover the ingredients for success in those programs which produce positive results.

References

Bracey, G. W. (1985, November) Not being promoted from kindergarten in like the death of a parent. Phi Delta Kappan, p. 245.

CTB/McGraw-Hill. (1981). Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Form U, Level B, Examiner's Manual. Monterey, California: Author.

Gredler, G. R. (1984). Transition classes: A viable alternative for the at-risk child? Psychology in the Schools, 21, pp. 463-470.

Leinhardt, G. (1980). Transition rooms: Promoting maturation or reducing education? Journal of Educational Psychology, 72, 55-61.

Matthews, H. W. (1977) The effect of transition education, a year of readiness and beginning reading instruction between kindergarten and first grade. (Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 5222.

Raygor, B. (1972). A five-year follow-up study comparing the school achievement and school adjustment of children retained in kindergarten and children placed in a transition class. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, 1526.

Shepard, L. A. & Smith, M. L. (1985). Boulder Valley kindergarten study: Retention practices and

retention effects. Boulder, Colorado: Boulder Valley Public Schools.

Shepard, L. A. & Smith, M. L. (1986, November). Synthesis of research on school readiness and kindergarten retention. Educational Leadership, pp. 78-86.

Talmadge, S. J. (1984, April). Transitional first grade: Promoting reading readiness or delaying reading instruction? Paper presented at the meeting of the Oregon-Washington Associations of School Psychology.

Table 1

Sex and Numbers of Subjects Assigned to Groups (not allowing for missing data

Type of Subject	Grade Level			
	Transition Grade	1st Grade	2nd Grade	3rd Grade
Non-Retained Targeted	T1 $n_m = 11$ $n_f = 15$	XT1 $n_m = 15$ $n_f = 5$		T3 $n_m = 10$ $n_f = 6$
Retained		KK1 $n_m = 15$ $n_f = 5$	T2 $n_m = 14$ $n_f = 4$	
Control		G1 $n_m = 28$ $n_f = 15$	G2 $n_m = 14$ $n_f = 4$	G3 $n_m = 10$ $n_f = 6$

Table 2

Summary Statistics - CTBS

For Entering Transitional (T1) and Regular First Graders (G1)

Group	Word Attack	Reading Vocabulary	Oral Comprehension	Reading Total
T1	$\bar{x}$ = 222.0 s = 97.7 n = 23	$\bar{x}$ = 299.0 s = 75.1 n = 23	$\bar{x}$ = 290.6 s = 154.5 n = 22	$\bar{x}$ = 296.2 s = 93.8 n = 22
G1	$\bar{x}$ = 411.9 s = 148.2 n = 29	$\bar{x}$ = 423.3 s = 85.3 n = 29	$\bar{x}$ = 431.8 s = 115.7 n = 29	$\bar{x}$ = 427.7 s = 80.3 n = 29
t-test	t = 5.44 df = 50 p < .01	t = 5.47 df = 50 p < .01	t = 3.51 df = 49 p < .01	t = 5.16 df = 49 p < .01

Table 3

Summary Statistics - Walker-McConnell

For Entering Transitional (T1) and Regular First Graders (G1)

Group	Teacher-Preferred Social Behavior	Peer-Preferred Social Behavior	School Adjustment Behavior	Total
T1	$\bar{x}$ = 49.84 s = 8.91 n = 25	$\bar{x}$ = 52.96 s = 11.96 n = 25	$\bar{x}$ = 33.28 s = 7.94 n = 25	$\bar{x}$ = 136.08 s = 22.97 n = 25
G1	$\bar{x}$ = 54.50 s = 13.14 n = 42	$\bar{x}$ = 58.41 s = 12.36 n = 42	$\bar{x}$ = 35.88 s = 10.37 n = 42	$\bar{x}$ = 148.79 s = 30.27 n = 42
t-test	t = 1.67 df = 65 $p < .05$	t = 1.78 df = 65 $p < .05$	t = 1.15 df = 65 n.s.	t = 1.94 df = 65 $p < .05$

Table 4

Summary Statistics - CTBS

Non-Retained, Targeted Second Graders (T3), and District Second Grade

Group	Reading Total	Language Total	Math Total
T3	$\bar{x}$ = 569.82 s = 60.07 n = 17	$\bar{x}$ = 553.88 s = 64.90 n = 17	$\bar{x}$ = 577.53 s = 73.20 n = 17
District Wide Second Grade (Excluding T3)	$\bar{x}$ = 622.57 s = 70.98 n = 1327	$\bar{x}$ = 606.26 s = 67.48 n = 1327	$\bar{x}$ = 638.04 s = 62.01 n = 1327
t-test	t = 3.49 df = 1342 p < .01	t = 3.21 df = 1340 p < .01	t = 3.29 df = 1341 p < .01

Table 5

Summary Statistics - Walker-McConnell for Non-Retained, Targeted Third Graders (T3) and Non-Retained, Non-Targeted Regular Third Graders (G3)

Group	Teacher-Preferred Social Behavior	Peer-Preferred Social Behavior	School Adjustment Behavior	Total
T3	$\bar{x}$ = 46.25 s = 14.23 n = 16	$\bar{x}$ = 47.81 s = 14.86 n = 16	$\bar{x}$ = 29.00 s = 7.24 n = 16	$\bar{x}$ = 123.06 s = 31.43 n = 16
G3	$\bar{x}$ = 58.38 s = 12.04 n = 16	$\bar{x}$ = 63.13 s = 12.95 n = 16	$\bar{x}$ = 36.88 s = 9.40 n = 16	$\bar{x}$ = 158.38 s = 29.60 n = 16
t-test	t = 2.60 df = 30 $p < .05$	t = 3.11 df = 30 $p < .01$	t = 2.65 df = 30 $p < .01$	t = 3.27 df = 30 $p < .01$

Table 6

Summary Statistics - CTBS

Entering Transitional Students (T1) and Transition Class Graduates (XT1)

Group	Word Attack	Reading Vocabulary	Oral Comprehension	Reading Total
T1	$\bar{x}$ = 222.0 s = 97.7 n = 23	$\bar{x}$ = 299.0 s = 75.1 n = 23	$\bar{x}$ = 290.6 s = 154.5 n = 23	$\bar{x}$ = 296.2 s = 93.8 n = 23
XT1	$\bar{x}$ = 472.4 s = 97.9 n = 15	$\bar{x}$ = 450.5 s = 58.4 n = 15	$\bar{x}$ = 430.4 s = 100.7 n = 15	$\bar{x}$ = 440.7 s = 65.8 n = 15
t-test	t = 7.49 df = 36 $p < .01$	t = 6.78 df = 36 $p < .01$	t = 3.24 df = 36 $p < .01$	t = 5.35 df = 36 $p < .01$

Table 7

Summary Statistics - Mean Walker-McConnell Ratings

Entering Transitional Students (T1) and Transition Class Graduates (XT1)

Group	Teacher-Preferred Social Behavior	Peer-Preferred Social Behavior	School Adjustment Behavior	Total
T1	$\bar{x}$ = 48.65 s = 10.62 n = 26	$\bar{x}$ = 51.69 s = 13.39 n = 26	$\bar{x}$ = 32.58 s = 8.56 n = 26	$\bar{x}$ = 133.23 s = 26.78 n = 26
XT1	$\bar{x}$ = 55.4 s = 15.14 n = 20	$\bar{x}$ = 62.90 s = 14.68 n = 20	$\bar{x}$ = 38.20 s = 9.89 n = 20	$\bar{x}$ = 156.50 s = 35.39 n = 20
t-test	t = 1.70 df = 44 p < .05	t = 2.66 df = 44 p < .01	t = 2.02 df = 44 p < .05	t = 2.45 df = 44 p < .01

Table 8

Summary Statistics. Mean Walker McConnell Ratings

Retained Targeted Second Graders (T2) vs. Non-Retained Targeted

Third Graders (T3)

Group	Teacher-Preferred Social Behavior	Peer-Preferred Social Behavior	School Adjustment Behavior	Total
T2	$\bar{x}$ = 54.44 s = 14.06 n = 18	$\bar{x}$ = 55.67 s = 13.54 n = 18	$\bar{x}$ = 36.72 s = 9.06 n = 18	$\bar{x}$ = 146.83 s = 32.98 n = 18
T3	$\bar{x}$ = 46.25 s = 14.23 n = 16	$\bar{x}$ = 47.81 s = 14.86 n = 16	$\bar{x}$ = 29.00 s = 7.24 n = 16	$\bar{x}$ = 123.06 s = 31.43 n = 16
t-test	t = 1.68 df = 32 n.s.	t = 1.60 df = 32 n.s.	t = 2.76 df = 32 $p < .01$	t = 2.15 df = 32 $p < .05$

Table 9

Summary Statistics - Mean CTBS Scale Scores

Transitional Graduates (XT1) vs Kindergarten Repeaters (KK1)

Group	Word Attack	Reading Vocabulary	Oral Comprehension	Reading Total
XT1	$\bar{x}$ = 472.4 s = 97.9 n = 15	$\bar{x}$ = 450.5 s = 58.4 n = 15	$\bar{x}$ = 430.4 s = 100.7 n = 15	$\bar{x}$ = 440.7 s = 65.8 n = 15
KK1	$\bar{x}$ = 342.9 s = 159.1 n = 15	$\bar{x}$ = 401.5 s = 89.4 n = 15	$\bar{x}$ = 443.5 s = 151.3 n = 15	$\bar{x}$ = 422.7 s = 108.8 n = 15
t-test	t = 2.59 df = 28 $p < .05$	t = 1.72 df = 28 n.s.	t = 0.27 df = 28 n.s.	t = 0.53 df = 28 n.s.

Table 10

Summary Statistics - Mean Walker-McConnell Ratings

Transitional Graduates (XTI) vs Kindergarten Repeaters (KK1)

Group	Teacher-Preferred Social Behavior	Peer-Preferred Social Behavior	School Adjustment Behavior	Total
XT1	$\bar{x}$ = 55.40 s = 15.14 n = 20	$\bar{x}$ = 62.90 s = 14.68 n = 20	$\bar{x}$ = 38.20 s = 9.89 n = 20	$\bar{x}$ = 156.5 s = 35.39 n = 20
KK1	$\bar{x}$ = 52.90 s = 14.31 n = 19	$\bar{x}$ = 58.63 s = 12.38 n = 19	$\bar{x}$ = 35.42 s = 11.30 n = 19	$\bar{x}$ = 146.95 s = 32.72 n = 19
t-test	t = 0.53 df = 37 n.s.	t = 0.98 df = 37 n.s.	t = 0.82 df = 37 n.s.	t = 0.88 df = 37 n.s.